# Trident Technical College

Sector: State Technical and Comprehensive Education System

1999-2000 Performance Year Score

81%

2.44 out of a Maximum of 3.00

#### **ACHIEVES STANDARDS**

See Interpreting Scores at bottom of page

(Fall 1999 data unless noted otherwise)

## **Performance Score Summary**

Total Applicable Indicators (incl. 2 now assessed within other indicators.)

Exceeded Standards (or received scores of 3) on

Achieved Standards (or received scores of 2.00-2.99) on

Did Not Achieve Standards (or received scores of 1.00-1.99) on

Achieved Compliance (or received scores of "Complied") on

Evaluated in Years Other Than Performance Year 1999-00

29 Indicators

3 Indicators

7 Indicators

5 Indicators

### Trident Technical College At A Glance

Mary D. Thornley, President 7000 Rivers Avenue PO Box 118067 Charleston, SC 29411-8067 (843) 574-6111 www.trident.tec.sc.us

713 Associates

FY 1998-99

Founded in 1964 For link to institution's mission, see www.che400.state.sc.us and select "Performance Funding"



Enrollment Headcount includes full and part time	9,882 100% of headcnt Undergraduate 91% of headcnt from SC at entry	Full-Time Faculty	228	incl. those holding academic rank & primary assignment of instruction, research or public service. (IPEDS)
	30% of headcnt Minority	Tuition	\$1,140	In County, Full-Time Student
Full-Time	3,647 (37% of headcnt)	Academic Year 1999-00	\$3,428	Out of State, Full-Time Student (incl. required tuition and fees,
Continuing Education	282,829 Technical Education & Occupational Advancement	i		IPEDS Inst. Characteristics Survey)
FY 1998-99	Program Contact Hours (Note: 1 CEU = 10 hrs)	Financial Dollars In Millions FY 1998-99		Total Revenue, excl. auxiliary Total Educ. & General Expend. excl. auxiliary
Degrees Awarded	492 Certificates 106 Diplomas			(IPEDS Finance Survey)

## **Interpreting Scores**

Comparing the average score on applicable indicators to the maximum 3.00 possible produces the percentage score shown in the upper right hand column. Institutions within the same sector whose percentage is in the same range as shown below are considered to to be performing at similar levels.

If Percent or Overall Score Range is:	Performance Category is:
95% to 100% or 2.85 to 3.00	Substantially Exceeds
87% to 94% or 2.60 to 2.84	Exceeds
67% to 86% or 2.00 to 2.59	Achieves
48% to 66% or 1.45 to 1.99	Does Not Achieve
33% to 47% or 1.00 to 1.44	Substantially Does Not Achieve

SC Commission on Higher Education's Ratings for the 1999-00 Performance Year to impact Fiscal Year 2000-01 Approved May 4, 2000. Report prepared by the Commission's Division of Planning, Assessment & Perf. Funding 1333 Main St., Suite 200 \* Columbia, SC 29201 \* (803) 737-2260 \* www.che400.state.sc.us

State's coordinating board for higher education (SC Commission on Higher Education or "CHE") measure annually each public institution's performance in various areas and base allocation of state appropriated dollars on performance. A 3-year, phase-in period was provided for CHE to design a system that translated indicators specified in legislation to measures and to provide a process translating performance to dollars. CHE worked with the business and higher education communities to design the current system which has evolved since its inital conceptualization. During the phase-in period as the system and indicators were defined, only selected indicators were used to determine a percentage of dollars received. Last year, CHE determined each institution's allocation for FY 1999-00 based on performance. The system continues to undergo refinements as measures and data are better understood. In the years ahead, standards set for SC's institutions will continue to increase in an effort to ensure and improve the quality of SC's public institutions of higher education so they will be globally competitive.

For the 1999-00 performance year, the SC Commission on Higher Education (CHE) rated each institution's performance on a set of measures approved by the CHE. Scores of 1 to 3 were awarded for performance on indicators or indicator subparts based on standards set last spring. Some standards were set by institutions and approved by CHE while others were set by CHE and were the same for all institutions. CHE, in limited cases, scored performance based on institutional appeals during the scoring process.

The range required for an institution to receive a score of 2 is shown below. Because of the method used to set standards, this range varies across indicators and institutions. Indicators where CHE considered an appeal and awarded scores based on that appeal rather than the range are noted. Applicable indicators for an institution depend on the institution's sector mission and individual characteristics as indicators are defined similarly for all institutions. To determine the overall score, the scores on applicable indicators are averaged. For indicators with multiple subparts, the subparts are scored and then averaged together to produce a single indicator score that contributes to the overall score. If the score for an indicator or subpart is:

- 3 The institution "Exceeds" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions or is at or above a standard identified to indicate a level beyond which continuous improvement is not expected.
- 2 The institution "Achieves" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions as indicated by the ranges shown below.
- 1 The institution "Does Not Achieve" the performance standard set for the institution or group of institutions.

Indicators Requiring Compliance - Some indicators require that an institution comply with a set of practices or policies. If an institution is in compliance the performance is scored "Complied" and no numeric score contributes to the final average. If an institution fails to comply, the institution receives a score of 1 for noncompliance. Indicators "On Cycle" - Some indicators are assessed at two or three year intervals.

Institution's 1999-00 Standard for N

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number /		(Time Period	Performance		"Achieves" or "2"		о О	Performance Score		
scriptive Measurement Title			Measured This Yr)	Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	( 1 if below (3 this #)	3 if above this #)	E S	Subpart	Indicator
1A	of e gen "Ins	ds expended to achieve mission based on ratio xpenditure category to total educational and eral expenditures. Expend. Category is truction"	(FY 98-99)	53.8%	53.8%	52.3% to	55.5%			2.00
1B	the sup rece	ricula offered to achieve mission measured as % of programs appropriate to degree level, ported by mission, & with full approval in most ent CHE program review.	(Spring 2000)	Not Avail	100%	95% to 99% or not one not appro				3.00
1C	onc	proval of a mission statement. CHE approves e every 5 years with changes being assessed in interim.	(initial '98)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance rec score of 1 is aw				Complied
1D	Ado	option of a strategic plan.	(FY 98-99)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance red score of 1 is aw				Complied
1E	Atta	inment of strategic plan goals.	(FY 97-98)	Complied	Complied	N/A, compliance rec score of 1 is aw				Complied
2A	2A Academic and other credentials of professors and instructors :								3.00	
	1	% headcount faculty teaching undergrads meeting Southern Assoc. of Colleges & Schools requirements	(Fall 1999)	100.0%	100.0%	97.0% to	99.9%	(2)	3	
	2a	% headcount faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses.	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	Not Avail	N/A, Compliance me this year only (new			Complied	
	2a 2b		(Fall 1999) (Fall 1999)	Not Avail	Not Avail		v measure tion of data		Complied Complied	
2B	<b>2b</b>	teaching undergraduate courses. % full-time faculty with terminal degree	,			this year only (new that required collect	v measure tion of data rear) nis year.			On Cycle
2B 2C	<b>2b</b> Facevee	teaching undergraduate courses.  % full-time faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses  ulty performance review system. Assessed	,	Not Avail	Not Avail	this year only (new that required collect during this ye Not assessed th	v measure tion of data rear) nis year.			On Cycle
	Fac eve Fac 3 ye	teaching undergraduate courses.  % full-time faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses  ulty performance review system. Assessed ry 3 years.  ulty post tenure review system. Assessed every	,	Not Avail	Not Avail On Cycle	this year only (new that required collect during this year Not assessed th Assessed next in Sp	v measure tion of data rear) nis year.	(3)		,
2C	Fac eve Fac 3 ye	teaching undergraduate courses.  % full-time faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses  ulty performance review system. Assessed ry 3 years.  ulty post tenure review system. Assessed every ears.	,	Not Avail	Not Avail On Cycle	this year only (new that required collect during this year Not assessed th Assessed next in Sp N/A	v measure tion of data rear) nis year.	(3)	Complied	N/A
2C	Facevee Face 3 years	teaching undergraduate courses.  % full-time faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses  ulty performance review system. Assessed ry 3 years.  ulty post tenure review system. Assessed every ears.  urage faculty compensation by rank:	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail 100% N/A	Not Avail On Cycle N/A	this year only (new that required collect during this year Not assessed th Assessed next in Sp N/A	v measure tion of data ear) nis year. pring 2002.		Complied	N/A
2C	Fac eve Fac 3 ye Ave	teaching undergraduate courses.  % full-time faculty with terminal degree teaching undergraduate courses  ulty performance review system. Assessed ry 3 years.  ulty post tenure review system. Assessed every ears.  trage faculty compensation by rank:  Instructor	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail 100% N/A \$36,926	Not Avail On Cycle N/A \$39,170	this year only (new that required collect during this year Not assessed the Assessed next in Sp. N/A \$37,723 to	v measure tion of data ear) his year. pring 2002.		Complied	N/A

NOTES:

- (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.
- (2) A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 2A1=100%; 2D1a=\$46,034
- (3) SC Technical Colleges do not have faculty rank. Average Instructor Salary shown is average for all faculty.

1999-00

Trident Tech Performance Year 1999-00

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number /			(Time Period	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"		N O		9-00 nce Score	
Descriptive Measurement Title		Measured This Yr)	Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	( I if below this #)	(3 if above this #)	T E S	Subpart	Indicator		
£.	2E	Ava	illability of faculty to students outside the classro	om as based	on standard	survey que	stions:				On Cycle
FACULTY (con't)		1	% classroom faculty rated satisfied on availability. Assessed every 2 years.		91%	On Cycle		sed this year. t in Spring 2001.		On Cycle	
;ULTY		2	% advisors rated satisfied on availability. Assessed every 2 years.		78%	On Cycle		sed this year. t in Spring 2001.		On Cycle	
FAC	2F		nmunity and public service activities of faculty for porporated into the measurement of Indicator 2B.	or which no ext	tra compens	ation is paid	d. This measure	e has been			
	3A Class size and student /teacher ratios : (Expected Ranges for 3A)								3.00		
		1a	lower division class size	(Fall 1999)	22.0	22.2	15	to 25			
		1b	upper division class size	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		in range	
		2a	% undergrad lecture sections of 50 & up	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	0.4%	0%	to 20%		_	
		2b	% lower division lecture of 100 & up	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	0.0%	0%	to 5%		in range	
_		3	FTE students per FTE teaching faculty	(Fall 1999)	17.8	18.2	14	to 19		in range	
XOAL	3B		erage # credit hours taught by full-time faculty ching at least 3 hours.	(Fall 1999)	271	283	264	to 279	(2)	_	3.00
, E	3C		io of full-time faculty as compared to other full- e employees.	(Fall 1999)	46.2%	45.0%	38.9%	to 40.0%	(2)		3.00
CLASSROOM QUALITY	3D	Acc	reditation of degree granting programs.	(Spring 2000)	80%	87%		% or all but 1 ogram	(4)		1.00
3	3E	Inst	itutional emphasis on quality teacher education				p. v	9.0			N/A
CLA		1	NCATE accreditation	(Spring 2000)	N/A	N/A	1	N/A		N/A	
		2a	% students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Professional Knowledge	(4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A	
		2b	% students passing NTE or PRAXIS II - Specialty Area Exams	(4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A	
		3a	% teacher ed. grads in critical shortage areas	(FY 98-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A	
		3b	% teacher ed. grads who are minority	(FY 98-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A		N/A	
COLLABORATION	4A	equ with	aring and use of technology, programs, ipment, supplies and source matter experts hin the institution, with other institutions, and/or the business community. Assessed every 3 rs.		Complied	On Cycle		sed this year. t in Spring 2002.			On Cycle
	4B		operation and collaboration with private industry. essed every 3 years.		Complied	On Cycle		sed this year. t in Spring 2002.			On Cycle
	5A	ехр	io of administrative expenditures to academic enditures, expressed as a %.	(FY 98-99)	22.7%	23.1%	32.7%	to 31.8%	(1) (2)		3.00
<b>∃NC</b> ⊀	5B	exte	e of best management practices measured by ent of incorporation of identified best practices. dessed every 2 years.		100%	On Cycle		sed this year. It in Spring 2001			On Cycle
<b>EFFICIENCY</b>	5C	Elin adn	nination of unjustified duplication of and waste in ninistrative and academic programs. Assessed ry 3 years.	(FY 99-00)	Complied	Complied		ice required or a is awarded.			Complied
EFFICIENCY	5D	Ger	neral overhead expenditures per full-time ivalent student.	(FY 98-99)	\$851	\$955	\$1,158	to \$1,125	(1) (2)		3.00
TS	6A		r scores of entering freshmen, % with 1000 r/20 ACT or higher.	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A			N/A
EQUIREMENTS	6B	% e 30%	entering freshmen with high school rank in top 6 or 3.0 GPA or higher on a 4.0 scale.	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A	to N/A			N/A
UIRE	6C	aca	icy for considering post-secondary non- demic achievements of non-traditional students, apliance with CHE guidelines.	(as of Spring 2000)	Complied	Complied		ice required or a is awarded.			Complied
QUIREMEN			ority on enrolling in-state students, based on								

NOTES: See last page for notes after

(4).

- (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.
- (2) A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 3B=280\*; 3C=40.1%; 5A=31.7%; 5D=\$1,124 (\*temporary level for current year)
- (4) Percentage reflects both programs accredited and on track for accreditation to be awarded by April 2002.

Trident Tech Performance Year 1999-00

Critical Success Factor / Indicator "Key" Number / Descriptive Measurement Title			(Time Period Measured This Yr)	Institution's Performance		1999-00 Standard for "Achieves" or "2"	N O	1999-00 Performance Score	
				Prior Yr '98-99	This Yr '99-00	( I if below (3 if above this #) this #)	T E S	Subpart	Indicator
	7A	Graduation rate :							1.00
		1 150% of program time, considers 1st-time, full-time, degree-seeking students.	1996 cohort	12.8%	10.1%	12.5% to 13.3%		1	
		150% of program time, excluding those enrolled in 2 or more developmental courses 1st semester (applies to Tech Colleges only).	same cohort as 7A1	14.9%	12.1%	14.6% to 15.5%		1	
	7B	Employment and education rate for graduates (Asses	sed every 2	years) :					Complied
ENTS		system for tracking undergraduates on members or continued education with response rate of 20%		Not Avail	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.		Complied	
GRADUATES' ACHIEVEMENTS		2 % graduates either employed or enrolled at a more advanced level		Not Avail	On Cycle	Not assessed while data is collected. Will be assessed with part 1 every 2 years		On Cycle	
АСН		3 % graduates employed within 1 year		Not Avail	On Cycle	starting with Performance Year 1999-00.		On Cycle	
ES.	7C	Employer feedback on graduates (Assessed every 2	years) :						Complied
JUAT		process for surveying employers who interview or hire prospective graduates		Not Avail	Complied	N/A, compliance required or a score of 1 is awarded.		Complied	
GRAL		employers' level of satisfaction with graduates interviewed		Not Avail	On Cycle	Not assessed while data is collected. Will be assessed with part 1 every 2 years		On Cycle	
		3 employers' satisfaction with employees		Not Avail	On Cycle	starting with Performance Year 1999-00.		On Cycle	
	7D	% of students passing professional examinations.	(4/1/98 - 3/31/99)	88.7%	90.0%	86.1% to 91.5%			2.00
	7E	Number of graduates continuing their education. This		as been inco	orporated in	to the measurement of Indicator	7B.		
	7F	Average credit hours earned compared to average required for program completed of students earning bachelor's degrees.	(Degrees earned in 1998-99)	N/A	N/A	N/A to N/A			N/A
	8 <b>A</b>	Transferability of credits to and from the institution (extent of compliance with CHE guidelines)	(Spring 2000)	100%	100%	97% to 99%	(2)		3.00
	8B	Continuing education programs for graduates and others measured as total CEU's produced in FY.  Applicable if CEU production >= 1000.	(FY 98-99)	40,600	28,300	29,700 to 31,500			1.00
임	8C	Accessibility to the institution of all citizens of the state	<b>:</b>						2.67
INSTITUTION		wno are minority (neadcount)	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	30.5%	27.5% to 29.3%	(2)	3	
Z		annual retention rate of SC degree-seeking undergrads who are minority.	(Fall '98 to Fall '99)	Not Avail	54.7%	48.8% to 51.8%	(2)	3	
		(neadcount)	(Fall 1999)	N/A	N/A	N/A to N/A		N/A	
		4 % teaching faculty who are minority (headcount)	(Fall 1999)	Not Avail	8.2%	7.9% to 8.3%		2	
ING	9A	Financial support for reform in teacher education measured as FY research expenditures for teacher education compared to most recent 3-yr average.	(FY 99 to Avg FYs 96, 97, 98)	N/A	N/A	N/A to N/A			N/A
FUNDING	9B	Public and private sector grants measured as FY restricted research expenditures compared to most recent 3-yr Average. (Applicable if >= \$1 million in annual expenditures)	(FY 99 to Avg FYs 96, 97, 98)	N/A	N/A	N/A to N/A			N/A
Summary	Ва	ased on data in the far right column, "1999-00 Perf Applicable Indicators 29 (including two that are as Exceeded standards (scores of 3) on 9 indicators	ssessed w		ndicators).	Subtotal : # of indicators averaged		36.67 15	
Summai		Achieved Standards (scores of 2.00 to 2.99) on 3 Did Not Achieve Standards (scores of 1.00 to 1.9 Achieved Compliance on 7 indicators. 5 indicator	9) on 3 in	dicators.		Average: Average / 3.00 Max Category is	:	2.44 81% ACHIEVES	

NOTES: (1) A downward trend is expected. If performance is lower than the low end of the range (# on right side of range shown) a 3 is awarded.

<sup>(2)</sup> A standard has been identified for this indicator at which continued performance is not expected and a score of 3 is awarded. If applicable, the range shown for a score of "2" has been adjusted to take into account this standard. The levels identified are as follows: 7F=110%; 8A=100%; 8C1=30.8%; and 8C2=60%\* (\* temporary level approved for current year)